Attorney Docket No. LKMP111US U.S. Patent Application No. 10/622,235

Response to Final Office Action dated: June 25, 2004

Date: September 23, 2004

Remarks

New Claims

New claims have been added to vary the scope of the claims and are fully supported by the specification. For example, teachings regarding the independent movement of rudder bodies and rudder members and the opposite rotation of rudder bodies are found in paragraphs [0027-0029] and Figures 9-10.

The Rejection of Claims 1-8, 11-15, and 18 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-8, 11-15, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,098,561 (Forthmann).

Anticipation requires that all of the elements of the claim be taught within the four corners of a single reference.

A. Applicants respectfully submit that Forthmann does not teach all the elements of amended Claim 1. Forthmann does not teach mounting first and second rudder bodies on either side of a centerline parallel with a keel of said vessel. Forthmann teaches a servopendulum rudder and an auxiliary rudder mounted in line with respect to a centerline of the vessel.

Forthmann does not teach rotating first and second rudder bodies around respective first axes and respective rudder members around respective second axes using at least one rotating means. Forthmann teaches a tandem consisting of a servo-pendulum rudder and an auxiliary rudder. The servo-pendulum rudder is rotated by positioning device 30 and the auxiliary rudder 20 is free to rotate, col. 4, lines 47-49, that is, not rotated by at least one rotating means.

Forthmann does not teach rotating first and second rudder bodies and at least one first and second rudder member to steer a vessel and control motion of the vessel. Forthmann teaches rotating a single servo-pendulum rudder for coarse correction steering of a sailboat operating under a fixed wind direction and is silent regarding ride control of the boat.

13

Attorney Docket No. LKMP111US

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/622,235

Response to Final Office Action dated: June 25, 2004

Date: September 23, 2004

B. Regarding amended Claim 4, assuming *arguendo* that the shaft of Forthmann is a rudder

body and the rudder of Forthmann is a rudder member, Forthmann cannot teach the independent

rotation of a rudder body and a rudder member by at least one rotating means, since the shaft and

rudder of Forthmann are formed into a single unit and are not free to move with respect to each

other. For example, in Figure 1, Forthmann clearly shows that any time shaft 11 is moved,

rudder 13 also is moved and vice versa. That is, if shaft 11 is rotated about "R," rudder 13 must

necessarily also rotate about "R." Similarly, any time rudder 13 is moved about "P," shaft 11

also must move about "P." Alternately, shaft 11 and rudder 13 are linked together through drive

connection 40 such that movement by positioning device 30 causing a simultaneous movement

of the shaft/rudder about "R" and "P." As noted above for Claim 1, Forthmann's auxiliary

rudder is not rotated by at least one rotatin means.

C. Applicants respectfully submit that Forthmann does not teach all the elements of

amended Claim 11. An noted above, Forthmann does not teach first and second rudder bodies

arranged to be rotated around respective first axis and respective rudder members arranged to be

rotated around respective second axis using at least one rotating means.

Forthmann does not teach first and second rudder bodies arranged to be rotated

independently of each other by at least one rotating means. For example, assuming arguendo

that the shaft of Forthmann is a rudder body, in Figure 1, Forthmann clearly teaches that the

movement of shaft 11 is linked to drive connection 40 and the shaft for the auxiliary rudder is

free to rotate. That is, the auxiliary rudder is not connected to a rotating means.

As noted above, Forthmann does not teach first and second rudder bodies and at least one

first and second rudder member arranged to be rotated so as to steer a vessel and control motion

of the vessel.

D. Applicants respectfully submit that Forthmann does not teach all the elements of

amended Claim 18. An noted above, Forthmann does not teach: first and second rudder bodies

mounted on either side of a centerline parallel with a keel of said vessel; first and second rudder

bodies arranged to be rotated around respective first axis and respective rudder members

arranged to be rotated around respective second axis using at least one rotating means; and first

14

Attorney Docket No. LKMP111US

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/622,235

Response to Final Office Action dated: June 25, 2004

Date: September 23, 2004

and second rudder bodies and at least one first and second rudder member arranged to be rotated

so as to steer a vessel and control motion of the vessel.

For all the reasons stated above, Forthmann does not teach all the elements of amended

Claims 1, 4, 11, and 18. Therefore, Claims 1, 4, 11, and 18 are patentable over Forthmann and

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn. Amended Claims 2 and 3,

dependent from Claim 1, also are patentable over Forthmann. Amended Claims 5-8, dependent

from Claim 4, also are patentable over Forthmann. Amended Claims 12-15, dependent from

Claim 11, also are patentable over Forthmann.

The Objection of Claims 9, 10, 16, 17, and 19 as Being Dependent Upon a Rejected Base Claim

Claims 9, 10, 16, 17, and 19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but the Examiner indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in

independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended Claims 4, 11, and 18 from which Claims 9 and 10, Claims 16 and 17,

and Claim 19, respectively, depend, to overcome the anticipation rejection of Claims 4, 11, and

18 under Forthmann. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 9, 10, 16, 17, and 19

are no longer dependent upon a rejected base claim and the Examiner is requested to withdraw

the objection to these claims.

New Claims 20-45

New Claims 20-27 depend from amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 1 is patentable over

the cited prior art. Therefore, new Claims 20-27 also are patentable over the cited prior art. New

Claim 28 depends from amended Claim 4. Amended Claim 4 is patentable over the cited prior

art. Therefore, new Claim 28 also is patentable over the cited prior art. New Claims 29-33

depend from amended Claim 11. Amended Claim 11 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Therefore, new Claims 29-33 also are patentable over the cited prior art. New Claims 34-45

depend from amended Claim 18. Amended Claim 18 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Therefore, new Claims 34-45 also are patentable over the cited prior art.

15

Attorney Docket No. LKMP111US U.S. Patent Application No. 10/622,235 Response to Final Office Action dated: June 25, 2004 Date: September 23, 2004

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Paul Maliszewski, P.E. Registration No. 51,990 CUSTOMER NO. 24041 Simpson & Simpson, PLLC 5555 Main Street Williamsville, NY 14221-5406 Telephone No. 716-626-1564

CPM/

Dated: September 23, 2004